UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/620,563	07/20/2000	June Dianne Martin	52493.000102	3863

7590 02/25/2005

Hunton & Williams,
Suite 1200
1900 K Street, N. W.,
Washington, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER	
JARRETT, SCOTT L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/620,563	MARTIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott L. Jarrett	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 December 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *9-32 and 41-50* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9-32 and 41-50* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Final Office Action is responsive to applicant's amendment filed December 9, 2004. Applicant's amendment of December 9, 2004 amended claims 9-32 and 41-50; claims 1-8 and 33-40 being previously canceled. Currently claims 9-32 and 41-50 are pending.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's arguments filed on December 9, 2004 with respect to claims 9-32 and 41-50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9-32 and 41-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonell, Edwin D., Document Image Technology (1993).

Regarding Claim 9 McDonell teaches a method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system. Further McDonell teaches that the method (step-by-step instructions, process, guideline,

methodology) includes a plurality of tools, techniques, templates, examples, case studies and the like for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery (document management, imaging solution, content management, etc.) system (Introduction, Pages xvii-xxv; Chapters 1-8, Pages 1-214; Figures 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 6.1, and 7.1).

More specifically McDonell teaches that the image-based document handling and delivery system implementation method comprises:

- planning activities (efforts, tasks, etc.) for gathering information about the business (infrastructure, people, process, technology) including but not limited to information about the current document handling system (manual workflows, current processes) used by the entity (2-4, Pages 35-114);

- implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system in response to the plurality of information (surveys, questionnaires, site surveys, joint application design sessions, pilot programs, prototypes, etc.; Pages 26-28, 32-33, 54-61, 175; Figures 2.1, 2.3, 2.4 and 5.6) provided by the entity regarding current work processes;

- creating (providing) a plurality of process maps (workflow, process diagrams, Warnier-Orr diagrams, work design, workflow engineering, work engineering, data flow diagrams, etc.; Chapter 2, Pages 46-49 and 54-61; Figures 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 and 2.3) for executing (implementing workflows, processes in the document management system), the image-based document handling and delivery system, the plurality of the maps (diagrams) comprising:

- at least one process map comprising a process map of the current document handling and delivery system (Paragraph 1, Page 60); and

- at least one process map for at least a portion of the image-based document handling and delivery system (Paragraph 2, Page 60); and

- a plurality of information regarding the documents including but not limited to document types, categories, formats, organization, size, location, usage (how often and it what capacity), and the like (Figures 3.2, 7.2; Pages 74 and 178-185); and

- the organizing and indexing of the documents.

McDonell further teaches that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system includes a plurality of tools, techniques, guidelines and the like for insuring the success and performance of the implementation of the image-based document handling and delivery system. (performance thresholds, performance measures, etc.; Pages 100-101, 108-109 and 131; Chapter 8, Pages 195-214; Figure 4.3) as well as a the utilization of project management resources/services (project plans, project team, etc.), risk management, quality assurance and problem ownership, resolution, solutions and the like (Pages 174-175).

McDonell further teaches that the image-based document handling and delivery system utilizes a client-server architecture (Pages 4, 130-132 and 148-153; Figures 1.1 and 6.1).

McDonell does not teach that the image-based document handling and delivery system implementation method is operable on a computer (can be automated) or propose a file naming convention for imaged versions of each document or the inclusion of more examples of the information in the documents.

Official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to provide and/or follow a file naming convention(s) when creating multiple versions (incarnations, copies, formats) of the same document (information, content, etc.) for doing so insures that the users of the documents are able to quickly identify the format (contents) of the file and/or avoid overwriting one copy (format) of a document over another copy of the document.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system as taught by McDonell would have benefited from providing file naming conventions to users of the method thereby insuring the documents created, managed and utilized as part of the system could readily be recognized and related to one another (i.e. ability to pull up all versions of the same document in multiple formats).

Official notice is taken that including example documents as a means for further defining/identifying a particular document type is well known.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system as taught by McDonell would have benefited from providing sample/example documents of the various document types utilized as part of the image-based document handling and delivery system further assisting users in understanding the type and nature of the plurality of documents in the system.

Further it is well settled that it is not "invention" to broadly provide a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity that has accomplished the same result. In re Venner, 120 USPQ 192.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system as taught by McDonell would have benefited from being made operable on a computer the resultant system being faster, easier to use and more efficient.

Regarding Claim 11 McDonell teaches that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system further comprises:

- a planning component for gathering information about the business including but not limited to information about the current document handling system (manual workflows, current processes) used by the entity;

- implementation of the image-based document handling and delivery system in response to the plurality of information (surveys, questionnaires, site surveys, joint application design sessions, pilot programs, prototypes, etc.; Pages 26-28, 32-33, 54-61, 175; Figures 2.1, 2.3, 2.4 and 5.6) provided by the entity regarding current work processes;

- creating (provides) a plurality of process maps (workflow, process diagrams, Warnier-Orr diagrams, work design, workflow engineering, work engineering, data flow diagrams, etc.; Chapter 2, Pages 46-49 and 54-61; Figures 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 and 2.3) for executing (implementing workflows, processes in the document management system), the image-based document handling and delivery system, the plurality of the maps (diagrams) comprising:

- at least one process map of the current document handling and delivery system (Paragraph 1, Page 60); and

- at lease one process map comprising at least a portion of the image-based document handling and delivery system (Paragraph 2, Page 60); and

- a plurality of information regarding the documents including but not limited to document types, categories, formats, organization, size, location, usage (how often and it what capacity), and the like (Figures 3.2, 7.2; Pages 74 and 178-185); and

- the organizing and indexing of the documents.

McDonnell further teaches reporting (evaluating, monitoring, fine-tuning) on the performance of the document handling and delivery system (Chapter 8: Evaluation and Fine Tuning, Pages 195-214) as well as the utilization of project

management services, quality assurance and risk management as part of the image-based document handling and delivery system implementation (Pages 18, 81-84, 107, 174-175 and 202).

McDonell does not expressly teach plurality of contingency guidelines for addressing each of a plurality of pre-determined errors and/or situations or propose a file naming convention for imaged versions of each document or the inclusion of more examples of the information in the documents.

Official notice is taken that managing the risks associated with the implementation and maintenance of a process, system or other such project is old and very well known in the art. Further it is well known that there exists a plurality of risk, quality and performance management methods, systems tools and techniques including but not limited to Six Sigma, quality assurance (improvement), total quality management, project management as well as solid engineering and design principles. These methods have been widely applied to a plurality of industries, businesses and manufacturing and non-manufacturing systems and that these methods can include all or some of the following tools/techniques:

- process diagramming/mapping;
- cause-effect analysis (fishbone & Ishikawa diagrams);

- failure modes effects analysis (the goal of preventing potential failure modes and their effects, applied to existing or new processes, typically represented in a tabular format); and

- process decision program chart (a method of graphically displaying as many alternatives and contingencies that can be determined in advance to strategies to dealing with them can be determined in advance).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the image-based document handling system implementation method as taught by McDonell would have benefited from employing any number of well known techniques for insuring the success and quality of the image-based document handling system including the use of contingency guidelines; the resultant method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system being more capable of understanding the nature of the system being built and taking steps to insure its quality, performance and ultimate success.

Official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to provide and/or follow a file naming convention(s) when creating multiple versions (incarnations, copies, formats) of the same document (information, content, etc.) for doing so insures that the users of the documents are able to quickly identify the format (contents) of the file and/or avoid overwriting one copy (format) of a document over another copy of the document.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system as taught by McDonell would have benefited from providing file naming convention to users of the method thereby insuring the documents created, managed and utilized as part of the system could readily be recognized and related to one another (e.g. the ability to pull up all versions of the same document in multiple formats).

Official notice is taken that including example documents as a means for further defining/identifying a particular document type is well known.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system as taught by McDonell would have benefited from providing sample/example documents of the various document types utilized as part of the image-based document handling and delivery system further assisting users in understanding the type and nature of the plurality of documents in the system.

Regarding Claims 12-13, 30-31, 21-22 and 44-45 McDonell teaches risk management, quality assurance, project management and performance measurement as part of the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system as discussed above.

McDonell does not expressly teach the use of contingency guidelines for addressing each of a plurality of pre-determined errors and/or situations.

Official notice is taken that managing the risks associated with the implementation and maintenance of a process, system or other such project is old and very well known in the art. Further it is well known that there exists a plurality of risk, quality assurance and performance management methods, systems tools and techniques and that the tools/methodologies call for a set of contingency guidelines further comprising of one or more possible solutions for each of the predetermined errors/situations that may arise during use of the system. One such tool is the process decision program chart discussed above.

Further the contingency guidelines would have comprised a list of potential errors, identified the entity (person, process, system, etc.) responsible for identifying, correcting and confirming the correction of errors, a plurality of communication mechanisms for reporting (communicating) errors and a recommended time frame for correcting each of the predetermined errors.

Another example of such a system is used by auto repair shops wherein the mechanics use diagnostic and other tools to identify predetermined errors (symptoms) which are then used to by the system/method suggest repairs including a plurality of information such as cost of the repair, parts needed, service hours to be charged for the repair and the like.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the image-based document handling system implementation method as taught by McDonell would have benefited from the use of contingency guidelines; the resultant method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system being more capable of understanding the nature of the system being built and taking steps to insure its quality, performance and ultimate success.

Regarding Claims 14, 23 and 46 McDonell teaches risk management, quality assurance, performance measurement and fine-tuning as discussed above.

McDonell does not expressly teach the use of failure modes effects analysis.

Official notice that the use of failure modes effects analysis (commonly referred to as FMEA and started by NASA in the 1970's) as part of a projects (systems) engineering and quality standards is well known and very old in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the image-based document handling system implementation method as taught by McDonell would have benefited from employing any number

of well known techniques for insuring the success and quality of the image-based document handling system including but not limited to the use of FMEA.

Regarding Claims 15, 24, 41 and 43 McDonell teaches that the image-based document handling and delivery system implementation method comprises:

- a plurality of frequently asked questions about imaged-based document handling and delivery systems (Pages 32-33, 48-55 and 125-130);

- a questionnaire for the entity (business, vendor, user, etc.) to complete (Figure 2.4, Pages 56-59);

- creating (providing) a plurality of process maps (workflow, process diagrams, Warnier-Orr diagrams, work design, workflow engineering, work engineering, data flow diagrams, etc.; Chapter 2, Pages 46-49 and 54-61; Figures 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 and 2.3) for executing (implementing workflows, processes in the document management system), the image-based document handling and delivery system, the plurality of the maps (diagrams) comprising:

- at least one process map of the current document handling and delivery system (Paragraph 1, Page 60); and

- at least one process map for at least a portion of the image-based document handling and delivery system (Paragraph 2, Page 60); and

- a plurality of information regarding the documents including but not limited to document types, categories, formats, organization, size, location,

usage (how often and it what capacity), and the like (Figures 3.2, 7.2; Pages 74 and 178-185); and

- the organizing and indexing of the documents.

McDonnell further teaches reporting (evaluating, monitoring, fine-tuning) on the performance of the document handling and delivery system (Chapter 8: Evaluation and Fine Tuning, Pages 195-214) as well as the utilization of project management services, quality assurance and risk management as part of the image-based document handling and delivery system implementation (Pages 18, 81-84, 107, 174-175 and 202).

McDonell does not expressly teach plurality of contingency guidelines for addressing each of a plurality of pre-determined errors and/or situations or propose a file naming convention for imaged versions of each document or the inclusion of more examples of the information in the documents.

Official notice is taken that managing the risks associated with the implementation and maintenance of a process, system or other such project is old and very well known in the art. Further it is well known that there exists a plurality of risk, quality and performance management methods, systems tools and techniques including but not limited to Six Sigma, quality improvement, total quality management, project management as well as solid engineering and design principles. These methods have been widely applied to a plurality of

industries, business and systems (manufacturing and non-manufacturing) as discussed above.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the image-based document handling system implementation method as taught by McDonell would have benefited from employing any number of well known techniques for insuring the success of the image-based document handling system including the use of contingency guidelines; the resultant method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system being more capable of understanding the nature of the system being built and taking steps to insure its quality, performance and ultimate success.

Official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to provide and/or follow a file naming convention(s) when creating multiple versions (incarnations, copies, formats) of the same document (information, content, etc.) for doing so insures that the users of the documents are able to quickly identify the format (contents) of the file and/or avoid overwriting one copy (format) of a document over another copy of the document.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system as taught by McDonell would have benefited from providing file naming conventions to users of the method thereby insuring the documents

created, managed and utilized as part of the system could readily be recognized and related to one another (i.e. ability to pull up all versions of the same document in multiple formats).

Official notice is taken that including example documents as a means for further defining/identifying a particular document type is well known.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system as taught by McDonell would have benefited from providing sample/example documents of the various document types utilized as part of the image-based document handling and delivery system further assisting users in understanding the type and nature of the plurality of documents in the system.

Regarding Claims 16 and 25 McDonell teaches that the questionnaires include a plurality of issues including but not limited to operational and technical issues (Figure 2.4, Pages 57-59; Page 153; Page 131). McDonell further teaches that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system utilizes project management services and involves a plurality of users (stakeholders) as well as the selection of a implementation team leader and task force (Pages 40, 43-46, 73-81, 188-193 and 195-198).

McDonell does not expressly teach that the questionnaire includes a request for contact information.

Official notice is taken that creating and retaining a contact list for a project is old and very well known in the art as means for improving the communication amongst the plurality of project team members. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system as taught by McDonell would have benefited from the ability of project team members to contact one another, via a contact list, regarding the project's ongoing progress or other forms of communication related to the project.

Regarding Claims 17 and 26 McDonell teaches that the method for implementing a image-based document handling and delivery system comprises a plurality of process maps including but not limited to process maps of existing processes (workflows, data flows, etc.) and a process map of the imaged-based document handling and delivery system as discussed above.

Regarding Claims 18 and 27 McDonell teaches that the process map for at least a portion of the image-based document handling and delivery system comprises a plurality of work flow related steps, data, people, tasks, etc. to be performed by the plurality of entities (people, process, technology) executing

(using, implementing, sending) and receiving documents (work design; Pages 46-49, 55-60; Figure 2.3).

Regarding Claims 19 and 28 McDonell teaches that the method further comprises a plurality of information regarding the documents including but not limited to document types, category, formats, file category, size, location, usage (how often and it what capacity), and the like (Pages 74 and 178-185; Figures 3.2, 7.2) as discussed above.

McDonell does not teach that the method includes a file naming convention for the imaged versions of each document or includes one or more examples of the information in the documents.

Official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to provide and/or follow a file naming convention when creating multiple versions (incarnations, copies, formats) of the same document (information, content, etc.) for doing so insures that the users of the documents will able to quickly identify the format (contents) of the file and/or avoid overwriting one copy (format) of a document over another copy of the document.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system as taught by McDonell would have benefited from providing

file naming convention to users of the method thereby insuring the documents created, managed and utilized as part of the system could readily be recognized and related to one another.

Official notice is taken that including example documents as a means for further defining/identifying a particular document type is well known.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system as taught by McDonell would have benefited from providing sample/example documents of the various document types utilized as part of the image-based document handling and delivery system further assisting users in understanding the type and nature of the plurality of documents in the system.

Regarding Claim 47 McDonell teaches that the process maps (workflows, work designs, etc.) include a plurality of information relating to the business process being mapped including but not limited to how the document is handled (used, manipulated, forwarded, processed, etc.) at a particular destination (recipient, step, etc.; work design; Pages 46-49, 55-60; Figures 1.5, 2.3).

Regarding Claims 48 and 50 McDonell teaches that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system includes

a plurality of means for reporting on a plurality of performance factors related to the system as discussed above.

Regarding Claim 49 McDonell teaches that the method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system includes a plurality of means for soliciting a plurality of information related to the existing document handling system as discussed above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Stiehler, Wayne E., U.S. Patent No. 5,603,069, teaches a system for creating process maps (process mapping) of business processes and the implementation (creation, development) of any system based on the process maps.

- Marpe et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,581,039, teach a system for the planning, management and execution of enterprise projects comprising a plurality

of modules including but not limited to: reporting and tracking, decision management, execution tools for planning and managing specific activities, a planning guide (step-by-step instructions for completing tasks) and references (example documents, training materials, etc.).

- Doyle, William P., U.S. Patent No. 5,233,513, teaches a system for implementing any enterprise system further comprising support for requirements analysis, business process mapping (existing and new workflows), project management tasks and activities, system migration planning, system error identification and correction, system recovery, and a plurality of other tasks, activities, events and the like associated with the implementation of an enterprise system.

- Lautzenheiser et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,023,572, teach a system for process mapping (modeling) including the information (documents, communications, etc.) associated with the business processes.

- Barnard et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,586,252, teach a system for failure mode effect analysis (FMEA).

- Hecht, Matthew S., U.S. Patent No. 5,535,322, teaches the implementation of a image-based document handling and delivery system.

- Mikel, Harry J., The Vision of Six Sigma – Tools and Methods for Breakthrough, teaches a plurality of well-known and commonly used tools and techniques related to Six Sigma, specifically the use and history of failure mode effects analysis (FMEA).

- Brassard, Michael et al., GOAL/QPC: Memory Jogger II, teach the availability of common quality tools including process mapping.

- Hoerl, Roger W., Six Sigma A Glimpse Into the Future of Statistics, teaches Six Sigma as an overall quality (business) improvement initiative that was initially popularized at Motorola. Hoerl further teaches the prevalent use of Six Sigma throughout General Electric.

- Sutton, Michael J., Document Management for the Enterprise, teaches a method for implementing an image-based document handling and delivery system (enterprise document management, EDMS).

- Nielson, Peter Soren et al., Creating Customer Solutions with Domino.Doc, teach a method for implementing a document handling and delivery system utilizing Domino.Doc and other commercially available software.

- Ebbers, Mike et al., Image and Workflow Library: Capacity Planning and Performance Tuning for VisualInfo and Digital Library Services, teach a commercially available document handling and delivery system.

- Ebbers, Mike et al., Image and Workflow Library: Smart Guide to EDMSuite System Managed Store, teach the commercially available enterprise document management systems from IBM. More specifically Ebbers et al. provide a step-by-step guide to implementing an EDMS.

- Wilkinson, Peter et al., IBM Enterprise Information Portal – A Primer, teach a method for implementing a enterprise document management system including step-by-step instructions (process, procedures).

- Wilkinson, Peter et al., IBM Enterprise Information Portal – A Practical Approach, teach a method for implementing a enterprise information portal, including a document management, including planning instructions and sample software.

- General Electric Evolution Toward Quality, teaches the well-known quality movement at General Electric and specifically the use of Six Sigma.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott L. Jarrett whose telephone number is (703) 306-5679. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hafiz Tariq can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SJ
2/17/2005

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600